

REMARKS

This Response accompanies a Petition for revival of an unintentionally abandoned application.

In the Official Action, claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, in that "a variable volume second control volume" did not have an antecedent basis. Claim 14 has been amended, since only one variable control volume is intended in that claim, and the remedy of claim 14 also remedies the rejection of claim 15.

Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled, and therefore the rejection thereof is moot.

Accordingly, applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GLEN J. CIBOTTH

By



L. James Ristas
Registration No. 28,663
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 6, 2006
750 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
(860) 527-9211
Our Ref: STAN/375/US
LJR/ds

G:\AYR saved docs\Filing Docs\Stan\stan375us\stan375us082906responselo OA.doc